1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
8						
9						
10	ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,	No.	C 10-03561 WHA			
11 12	Plaintiff,					
13	v. SPECIAL VERDICT FORM					
	GOOGLE INC.,					
14	Defendant.	/				
15 16						
17	YOUR ANSWERS MUST BE UNANIMOUS.					
18						
19	1 Har Overlanders have a		oidene de Cereleinfrie			
20	1. Has Oracle proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Google infringer claims 11, 27, 29, 39, 40, and 41 of United States Patent Number RE38,104?					
21	Claims 11, 21, 29, 39, 40, and 41 of Cliffe	Yes	No			
22		(Infringing)	(Not Proven)			
23	CLAIM 11:					
24	<b>CLAIM 27:</b>					
25	<b>CLAIM 29:</b>					
26	<b>CLAIM 39:</b>					
27	<b>CLAIM 40:</b>					
28	CLAIM 41:	<u></u>				

1	2.	Has Oracle proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Google infringes					
2	claims 1 and	ns 1 and 20 of United States Patent Number 6,061,520?					
3			Yes	No			
4			(Infringing)	(Not Proven)			
5		CLAIM 1:					
6		CLAIM 20:					
7							
8	3.	Has Oracle proven by clea	r and convincing ev	dence that Google willfully			
9	infringed an asserted patent? (Answer this question only if you answered "Yes" to a prior						
10	question.)						
11			Yes (Willful)	No (Not Willful)			
12		FOR THE '104 PATENT:	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(2100 1111111)			
13		FOR THE '520 PATENT:					
14		201122					
15							
16	Dated: May	y 2012					
17	Dated. Ivia			FOREPERSON			
18							
19							